

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to Claim 15 because in the fourth line "LPC Transaction Packet" should be plural. Applicants have so amended the claim, which also require other corrections in order to conform to this change.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language and states that these claims are omnibus type claims.

We can not agree. The MPEP defines an omnibus claim as one that reads as follows:

"A device substantially as shown and described."

The present claims do not fit this formulation and are not omnibus claims. For example, Claim 1 recites a portable computer having a bus for peripheral devices, a docking station to receive that portable computer and the peripheral devices and a PCI Express fabric coupling a portable computer to the docking station. In this case, all three elements are recited as being coupled to each other, and are therefore not omnibus type claims.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-18 as contained in the trademark/trade name PCI_Express. Accordingly, Applicant's have replaced this term with the following:

"A serial switched topology used to connect peripheral devices to a computer"

Or in later recitations in the same claims;

"serial switched topology".

The Examiner rejects Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Konetski. The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martwick in view of creating a PCI Express Interconnect, referred to as Bhatt and the PCI Express Base Specification Revision 1.0a. The Examiner rejects Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Bhatt and the PCI Express Specification.

Applicants can not agree that these references anticipate the present invention or render it obvious. For example, Konetski shows the addition of another processor 205 and not a peripheral as in the present invention. Applicants specifically traverse the Examiner's statement that the signals on the LPC bus are subset of the signals on the PCI bus. In addition, Applicants note that the PCI bus is a parallel bus whereas the present invention tunnels the LPC Packets via a serial bus.

However, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have decided to accept the claims the Examiner considers to have allowable subject matter which are claims 2-5, and 7-18. These claims have been amended in order to replace the PCI_Express trademark and to correct the other areas referred to above.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 

William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452